



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MR. FROUDE'S HISTORICAL METHOD.

HAD Mr. Froude's articles on "Romanism and the Irish Race in the United States" appeared anonymously, they would have been allowed to pass by unheeded, as a very ordinary contribution to anti-Catholic sensational literature. Our ears are so familiar with the outcries and screams of the alarmist that we do not take the trouble to stop to ask him for the grounds of his terror. But, when a literary Englishman condescends to warn us of dangers ahead, we can not but feel the propriety of listening to him with at least apparent seriousness—to such an extent has our intellectual provincialism become a second nature with us. It is pleasant, however, to reflect that an American scholar could not have stooped to the flippant garrulousness of these articles. Polemics of this kind are with us abandoned to the more vulgar sort of men; and it is not without a certain sense of humiliation that I undertake to point out some of the misstatements and fallacies of this popular writer. There is, indeed, no special reason why this should be done at all, other than the very flimsy one furnished by Mr. Froude's name, for, both in his facts and his arguments, he merely treads again the well-beaten path with which we are all familiar.

A writer's method gives us the truest insight into the value of his work; and Mr. Froude's spontaneity of character does not permit him to conceal from his readers his literary secret. "It often seems to me," he says, "as if history was like a child's box of letters, with which we can spell any word we please. We have only to pick out such letters as we want, arrange them as we like, and say nothing about those which do not suit our purpose."* The intellectual frivolousness which permits one to look upon history in this way is incompatible with the love of truth, and there is but a step from arranging facts to falsifying them.

* "Short Studies," vol. i., "The Science of History," p. 1.

Mr. Froude, in the articles under review, has shown us how he applies this historical method to suit his purpose. "In 1785," he says, "there was one Roman Catholic bishop in the United States, with fifty priests and twelve churches. The Roman Catholic population was French or Spanish. They had neither school, college, convent, nor monastery. They were declining in numbers, or were being absorbed into the preponderating Anglo-Saxon element." Now, in point of fact, there was no Roman Catholic bishop at all in the United States in 1785. There were not fifty priests, and the Catholic population was not French or Spanish. The first bishop was consecrated in 1790; he estimated the number of priests to be about twenty-five, and the forty thousand Catholics then in the country were chiefly Americans, the descendants of the English and Irish Catholic settlers of Maryland. The French had colonized Louisiana, but that was purchased by the United States only in 1803. The American Catholics had no school or convent in 1785, for the simple reason that even in Maryland, where they had first proclaimed the principles of religious liberty, the colonial legislation had made it a crime for a Catholic to teach school or hold public worship; but that their numbers were diminishing is a gratuitous assertion for which there is no evidence. All this is of course unimportant, except as an instance of the way in which Mr. Froude uses his historical letter-box. In the brief passage which I have quoted, we have examples of the triple pseudo-historical process of falsification, invention, and arrangement. We will proceed to a more weighty matter. "Before English rule had established itself in the shape of the policeman," says Mr. Froude, "the numbers of the Celtic race were kept down by internal wars and feuds, and want of food. The Irish annals are a monotonous record of fights among the O's and the Mac's, of farmsteads burned and cattle carried off as spoil . . . the people lived like wild animals upon meat and grass; and in Spenser's time the Celtic population scarcely amounted to half a million. . . . All that they were suffering was laid at England's door—and, indeed, in a sense, with justice; for except for us they would never have been alive to suffer."

Mr. Froude wishes to prove that the Irish race would have perished by its own hands had it not been preserved from destruction by English rule; and he does this by telling us that their feuds had been so incessant and bloody that the Celtic population was in Spenser's time reduced to half a million. Now, Spenser lived four hundred years after the invasion of Ireland by the Anglo-Normans, and

the diminished population of his day would show that English rule had been fatal to Ireland. Again, when Mr. Froude says that the Irish population was reduced to half a million in the time of Spenser, he makes an assertion which, as he must know, can not be proved to be true. His authority is Spenser himself, who, in the report which he gave to Queen Elizabeth of the condition of Ireland in 1596, makes this estimate of the population ; but his opinions on this subject were based upon conjecture, and he was besides interested in making it appear that the enemies of the Queen were few. But, even in the supposition that he was not far astray, the condition of Ireland was at that time not worse in this respect than that of England. In Spenser's time Sir Edward Coke declared, in the House of Commons, that he, together with Popham, Chief Justice, was employed to take a survey of all the people of England, and that they found them to be nine hundred thousand of all sorts. Ireland then had more than half the population of England, whereas now, after two centuries more of English police protection, it has but a fifth. Mr. Froude has himself elsewhere explained to us the causes which reduced the population of Ireland, and brought the people to live like wild animals on meat and grass. He is speaking of the soldiers of Elizabeth in Spenser's time : "When sent to recover stolen cattle," he says, "or punish a night foray, they came at last to regard the Irish peasants as unpossessed of the common rights of human beings, and shot or strangled them like foxes or jackals. More than once in the reports of officers employed on these services we meet the sickening details of these performances related with a calmness more frightful than the atrocities themselves ; young English gentlemen describing expeditions into the mountains 'to have some killing,' as if a forest was being driven for battue." Again : "She did not conquer Ulster, but she bribed the inferior tribes to rise against the O'Neills. She made use of a piratical colony of Scots, who had settled in Antrim, whom Shan had injured. Sir Henry Sidney ravaged Tyrone and fixed a garrison in Derry." Again : "But she was not content to do the work alone. Against the Irish fighting on their own soil, among bogs and mountains and forests, other allies were more efficient than English soldiers. The Butlers were let loose on their ancient enemies. Every living thing was destroyed by which the insurrection could maintain itself. The corn was burned in the field ; the cattle were driven into the camp and slaughtered. The men who could bear arms were out with their chief ; the aged and the sick, the women and the little ones,

perished all in the flames of their burning homes. The official records of this deadly war return the killed and hanged in tens of thousands ; and famine took up the work where neither sword nor rope could reach." Again : " Lord Mountjoy took his place in Ireland, and the conduct of a war that had been too long trifled with was at length in efficient hands. . . . The country was so dreadfully wasted that children were killed and eaten for food. In one place three wretched little creatures were found feeding on their dead mother."*

This is Mr. Froude's own account of Elizabeth's Irish wars "in Spenser's time," and surely there is no need to hunt up the fights among the O's and the Mac's to explain how the population was reduced to half a million, and the people driven to live like wild animals on meat and grass. It would have been beyond the purpose, however, to have given these facts in the articles on "Romanism and the Irish Race in the United States," the intent of which is to embitter Americans against the Irish people and the Catholic Church. He therefore has recourse to his historical letter-box, picks out the letters he wants, arranges them as he likes, and says nothing about the rest. It is an application, in another sphere, of the famous maxim of the old Pennsylvania politician—"Addition, division, and silence," with "subtraction in the place of addition." It is an undisputed fact that clan-fights were common in Ireland during the middle ages, as feuds and petty wars were common in England and on the Continent of Europe. It is also certain that Spenser put the population of Ireland in his day at half a million. Mr. Froude takes these two facts, and sets them side by side, as though they were cause and effect, keeping all the while profound silence concerning the butcheries, and burnings and hangings and famines by which the English Government had brought the Irish race to the verge of destruction.

If historic truth is sacred, dishonesty of this kind is as base as thievery.

Let us take another example of Mr. Froude's method. He wishes to make light of the heroic fortitude with which the Irish people have held to their faith, by showing that their fidelity was due not to themselves but to circumstances. Had Protestantism been presented to them in its Calvinistic form, they might, he thinks, have accepted it. Why? Because "Calvinism suited the

* "The English in Ireland," vol. i., pp. 51, 52, 55, and 62.

Celtic nature. It was born in France ; it was bred in Switzerland ; it was adopted by Scotland ; the Highlanders accepted it at last ; and the Welsh, if they are not Calvinists, are Protestants of an extremely emotional type." This is a curious example of the way in which Mr. Froude picks out and arranges his historical letters to make them spell the word which he wishes to bring under his reader's eye. Calvinism was born in France, but it has virtually perished there : it was adopted by the Lowland Scotch, but they are not Celts ; and the Welsh, who are Celts, are not Calvinists at all, but Methodists ; and, on the other hand, Calvinism is the religion of the Protestants of Holland, of a considerable portion of the Protestants of Germany, of the Puritans of Old England and New England, none of whom are Celts ; and Calvinism too is precisely the one form of Protestantism which showed life and zeal in Ireland, and which the Celtic population there rejected with even more aversion than the Establishment, which was too hollow a sham to excite intense feeling of any kind. It is not probable that Mr. Froude really thinks there is any sympathy between the Irish character and Calvinism ; he means something quite different when he asserts that Calvinism suited the Celtic nature, as the following words show : " Oliver's hand was hard," he says, " but there was no hypocrisy about him. Clear action was for once taken on the real facts of the situation. The Irish were a conquered people and were treated as a conquered people. . . . Two generations of the iron hand, and the Irish would, in all likelihood, have followed the example of the Highlanders." What " two generations of the iron hand" means, we all know. Mr. Froude has told us what Elizabeth's Irish wars were : Cromwell's were yet more savage and murderous. In his butcheries half the people had perished, and the survivors were dying of hunger in the bogs and glens in which they had sought refuge from the fury of the troopers. Wolves prowled around the gates of Dublin, and wolf-hunting and priest-hunting grew to be lucrative diversions. Had this state of affairs gone on for two generations, the Celtic population would have perished utterly, and this is doubtless Mr. Froude's meaning when he says Calvinism was best suited to their nature. This, in fact, is implied in his reference to the Irish penal code. " They" (the English) he says, " extended their penal laws to Ireland, but they allowed them to be executed only far enough to exasperate, while the creed which they were designed to extinguish intensified its hold. Persecution may succeed if it is thorough-going. It is the wildest of follies if

the hand is lifted only to show that it can not or will not strike." The fault he finds in the Protestant persecution of the Irish Catholics is that it was not thorough-going. In point of fact it stopped barely short of the destruction of the Celtic population in Ireland, and what Mr. Froude would like, therefore, is that they had been blotted out of existence altogether. His desire is but the expression of the policy of the British Government, as made known to us by Protestants themselves. "The favorite object of the Irish Governors," says Leland, "and of the English Parliament was the utter extirpation of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland"; and Warner adds that "they hoped for the extirpation not of the mere Irish only, but of all the English families that were Roman Catholic."

Infamous as the penal code was—the contrivance of devils, according to Montesquieu, which ought to have been written in blood and registered in hell—its execution was even more cruel and tyrannous than the law itself; and yet Mr. Froude would have us believe that the hand of the persecutor was lifted only, but did not strike. The mental state which renders such perversion of the most universally admitted facts of history possible is pathological, and is interesting even as a study in psychology. Mr. Froude, I would fain believe, is less a willful and conscious perverter of historic truth than a victim to the Englishman's inability to understand or appreciate anything that is not English; and in the case of the Irish people this incapacity is intensified by the action of that low and unworthy instinct which prompts us to hate those whom we have deeply wronged.

The woes and miseries of Ireland have been great enough, one would think, to appease the fiercest and most vindictive enemy, but they seem only to excite the rage of this strange man, as the taste of blood rouses the fury of beasts of prey; and the cries of the famishing multitudes serve to remind him that, as the starving people will be again driven to the shores of America, it is his duty to poison the public mind, so that even here the Irish Catholic may find no refuge from the blight and curse of English oppression. Enough of this. The Irish question has been thrust forward by Mr. Froude in the present instance to serve as a cover for what even he can not but feel to be a wanton and unprovoked attack upon the Catholics of the United States. The secret of his hatred of the Church he partly reveals in the following words: "The Catholic Church has sanctified the Irish cause. It has made patriotism respectable. It has given the peasantry the sympathy of Catholic Europe.

Without their religion they would have yielded long ago." A religious faith which is capable of inspiring such heroic and unwearying resistance to tyranny can hardly be the foe of freedom. If Mr. Froude's inability to distinguish between truth and falsehood were not so undeniably manifest, his views on Catholicism in America would be set down to the score of sheer ignorance. To represent the Church of this country, as he does, as a purely Irish Church, is simply absurd. There is a strong German element in the American Church. Thirteen of our bishops are Germans or of German descent. The descendants of the Maryland colonists, together with the converts, are chiefly of English origin; and they also are well represented in the hierarchy. In Louisiana, and in several States of the East and West, there is a very respectable Franco-American and French-Canadian Catholic population. It is, therefore, simply ridiculous to speak of the Church in the United States as simply an Irish Church.

In a work published some seven years ago, Mr. Froude declared that "the Irish themselves lose their papal fervor when settled in countries where Popery is no longer identical with patriotism."* He now shakes up his box again, picks out other letters, and finds that the words which they spell tell quite another story.

Far from losing their papal fervor in this country, where, according to his own assertion, their faith is not only not identical, but is incompatible with patriotism, the Irish manifest here a Catholic zeal, Mr. Froude declares, which goes beyond anything claimed for them even by those who have most reason to be delighted with the fruits of their religious fervor. "The Irish in America," he says, "marry wholly among themselves and within their own creed." Now, this is absurdly false, as the chancery records of every diocese in the United States will show. They marry neither wholly among themselves nor wholly within their own creed, though the Church strongly opposes mixed marriages, because the tendency of such unions is to produce religious indifference both in the parents and the children. "The lapses from the faith," he continues, "once relatively large, have now wholly ceased." This, too, I regret to be compelled to say, is false. The number of those who fall away from the faith is smaller in proportion to the Catholic population than it was twenty-five years ago, but to affirm that defections have wholly ceased is to be regardless of facts. "The Irish race the

* "The English in Ireland," vol. i, p. 39.

other side of the Atlantic," Mr. Froude goes on to say, "remains as separate from the Anglo-Saxon as it is at home." The American is not an Anglo-Saxon. He is the child of many peoples ; in his veins flows the intermingled blood of the English, the Irish, the Scotch, the German, the Dutch, the French, the Swede, and other European nations. The Yankee even, in his westward progress, intermarries with all the world. To affirm, therefore, that any race remains separate from the Anglo-Saxon in the United States is to talk nonsense. But Mr. Froude evidently means to say that the Irish Catholics form a body apart in this country, and hold themselves aloof from the American people. This, again, is absurdly false ; and the gentleman who, as he informs us, told him in New York that it takes about half an hour to make an American of an Irishman, spoke the truth. If an Irishman had no other reason for loving this country than our victorious rebellion against English tyranny, that of itself would suffice to make him loyal. If I may speak my own thought, I will say that I find in the children of our Irish Catholics a tendency to what I call ultra-Americanism. They are so intensely American that they often fail to recognize the obvious defects of our society and the shortcomings of American character. Mr. Froude's prejudice blinds him to the plainest facts when he imagines that the Catholics form a separate and distinct people in this great republic. We can say to him what Tertullian said to our enemies sixteen hundred years ago : "It is too late ; we are already everywhere ; we are a part of the national life, and to rage against us is to be cruel to yourselves."

This suicidal strife is precisely what Mr. Froude desires to stir up among us ; and it may be fairly doubted whether this loyal Englishman would be most pleased by the destruction of the republic or the ruin of the Church. Having labored earnestly to persuade his readers that the Catholics of this country form an *imperium in imperio*, he next proceeds to give a somewhat rhetorical description of the Catholic revival during the present century. "In the great war against the English Reformation," he says, "the Catholics have won the first campaign. . . . A united Italy may have stripped the Pope of his immediate dominions ; but in every country in the civilized world the Papacy has recovered a practical power which more than compensates the loss. It divides France with the Republicans. It brings to terms the imperious German statesman. It is the enemy of freedom, yet its power is greatest under the freest governments. It has delivered Ireland from Prot-

estant ascendancy. It invades America by Irish arms. In England, if not as yet politically powerful, it has converted the Anglican Church into a training-school by the infection of its principles. Romanism unquestionably is everywhere recovering itself, putting out extraordinary energy, rousing something like the old enthusiasm, and making progress most where her enemies had been strongest." Just two pages further on he concludes his whole argument by declaring that "Romanism" is dead. "A galvanic grammar of assent," he says, "may make the dead limbs seem to move; but the movement is artificial. The heart does not beat, the blood does not run in the veins. The life once gone does not come back again." It may be fairly doubted whether there is in all literature anything more curious than this; certainly stronger evidence of the pathological condition of Mr. Froude's mental state could not be desired. Here are two lengthy essays in which the growing life and energy of the Catholic Church form the groundwork of the whole argument. Her vigor is described in the boldest imagery: "The belief which our fathers had believed to be dead is rising like a thunderstorm against the wind. . . . The Church is growing again like another Antæus, and a fresh conflict is now not very far off. . . . Like the mythological monster, it has been in contact with the hard soil of fact, and has gathered fresh life from it." In the New World "the lapses from the faith have wholly ceased, and the Roman Catholic body is the largest, strongest, and wealthiest in the Union. . . . Protestantism, disorganized and disunited, fights at frightful disadvantage against the homogeneous Roman army. . . . The Catholic revival is a fact. . . . The forces which rule the evolution of humanity are not mechanical, but vital. . . . The Catholic religion is an organic force of this kind." And then comes the incredible conclusion of the whole argument. The belief which is rising like a thunderstorm against the wind is extinct. The Church which is growing like another Antæus is dead. The Catholic revival is not a fact. "The heart does not beat; the blood does not run in the veins. The life once gone does not come back again. . . . Language of this kind," says Mr. Froude, "is permitted in the New World because of its absurdity." He is evidently an Hegelian, and holds that the principle of contradiction has no logical validity. The special shock which roused him to the present outburst against the Catholic Church and the Irish race he received from a book recently published in New York, and entitled "Roman Catholicism in

the United States." It is an anonymous publication, and anonymous diatribes do not receive the serious attention of men of sense ; but Mr. Froude is persuaded that this writer has concealed his name through fear of the vengeance of the Church—of that mysterious living organism whose heart does not beat, in whose veins the blood does not run. "No public man in the United States," he informs us, "likes to provoke the animosity of a party which is so powerful in the Eastern cities. The attitude is one of astonishment and perplexity." Would it be possible to write a more ridiculous phrase ? Party lines are drawn somewhat close in this country, and within the party liberty of speech is more or less restricted ; but, when there is question of opening up on the foe, the reins are thrown down, and our knights of the quill ride at full tilt. Moreover, the spirit of vindictive hate is neither in the character nor the customs of Americans. We forgive and forget ; we live and let live. The Know-nothing party was the most fanatical organization which has ever sought to harm the Church in the United States, and yet it happens again and again that men who were prominent Know-nothings are elected to office by Catholic votes. Mr. Froude could give no better proof of his ignorance of our habits of thought than the assertion that an honest man here has anything to fear in making an open and honorable attack upon the Catholic Church. The thing is preposterous on its very face. We are but a feeble minority ; the Protestant tradition concerning Catholicism is still more or less current among the masses ; and now, as in the days of Sterne, the Pope is a real godsend to many a verbose and brainless fellow. When an American conceals his name in order to attack the Church, it is not because he is afraid, since there is nothing to fear, though it may be because he is a coward of the kind that conscience makes. Mr. Froude's anonymous writer I have not read ; but the quotations from him, given in these articles, show him to be merely a commonplace anti-Popery declaimer. To Mr. Froude he proves a veritable Will-o'-the-wisp, who leads him into all sorts of intellectual quagmires, in which he flounders about without being able to reach the solid ground of a definite solution of the problem which so sorely vexes his anxious soul. The anonymous guide informs him that America is "the chief representative of the liberty, progress, and civilization with which the Pope refuses to reconcile himself." Mr. Froude replies in tones sad enough to be the echo of the voice of Dante following Virgil to the gate over whose high arch was inscribed the "*Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch'entrate.*" "Progress !"

he exclaims ; " but progress whither ? Liberty ! but what use is to be made of it ? What aim are we to set before ourselves ? It is exactly by these undefined commonplaces that the wearied man, to whom life is an earnest thing, who believes that he has been placed in this world, not to exercise his rights, but to learn his duty and to do it, is driven back upon a system which at least knows what it is about. Men can not live on bottled moonshine or feed on fractions whose denominator is nothing. Modern civilization builds fine cities and houses, and constructs railways, and sends the lightning on its message ; but, when the ordinary human being inquires to what purpose his powers are to be directed, the answer is, that he is to make money and improve his circumstances ; and he knows that he is made for something better, and turns away in disgust. If this is all which civilization means, he will take the Pope in preference." This nameless American guide has put the canonizer of Henry VIII. and the defamer of Mary Stuart in no sweet mood. " It is one thing," the cicerone goes on to explain, " to allow to all men the right to choose any religion they please ; it is quite another to allow a Church, as dangerous and powerful as the Church of Rome, to sow the seeds of dissolution and destruction without doing something to check the evil in its stages of incipency." " Doing something !" cries Mr. Froude impatiently ; " but what is to be done ?"

The danger " must be encountered," answers the guide, " with a renewal of Protestant energy and the robustness of thought which that energy produces." " Bottled moonshine !" retorts Mr. Froude angrily ; " Protestantism has failed, we can not live upon negations ; we must have convictions of a positive sort, if our voyage through earthly existence is to be an honorable and successful one. And no Protestant community has ever succeeded in laying down a chart of human life with any definite sailing directions. . . . They" (the Catholics) " know what they mean, and we do not know what we mean ; and modern Protestantism will and must fight a losing battle against a communion which professes to value truth and claims to teach it, till it has some truth of its own to insist upon." These pilgrims make but poor progress, and there seems to be danger lest they stick fast in the Slough of Despond, and so fail in the high emprise of showing how the Great Dragon may be slain. We will continue to follow their movements. " The American," suggests the guide, " who is proud of his country, and believes in the institutions which have made it great, perceives that Romanism is as inconsistent with a republican form of government as slavery

was." The gloomy brow of Mr. Froude lights up with sudden joy. "The allusion to slavery," he says, "is extremely significant. The Americans are thorough-going when they are roused. The civil war showed what they would do if their country or their principles were really in danger, and, if the progress of Romanism creates difficulties with which the Constitution can not deal, they will not sacrifice realities to scruples of form. A Falk law in the last extremity may not be impossible. . . . Before Romanism can become dominant the question will have to be fought out with bullets instead of with balloting-papers; and though the zeal of the converts is hot enough to build churches and monasteries, and produce libraries full of sentimental theological literature, we doubt whether it is of the sort that would figure respectably on a battle-field." The insult is gratuitous and wanton. It is not even a smart hit. Englishmen certainly have no reason to complain of lack of courage in Catholics, as shown on American battle-fields by such soldiers as Lafayette, DeKalb, and Kosciuszko; and Americans know that some of the bravest generals of the republic are Catholics, and in part converts. But Mr. Froude is altogether astray when he imagines that this is a question which can be settled by bullets. If bullets were efficacious against the faith of the immortal soul, there would to-day be no question of the Catholic Church at all, either in England or in Ireland. In Germany the battalions and bullets are all on the side of Bismarck; and yet Mr. Froude himself declares that the Church has brought the imperious Chancellor to terms. Falk laws have been carried into execution there with a rigor which would not be possible in a republic; and the most obvious result is a reawakening of Catholic life and zeal. Suffering degrades or ennobles; makes brutes or heroes. To suffer persecution and yet to be without hope and without God in the world is a curse fraught with all evil; but to suffer persecution for righteousness' sake, trusting in the God who will not permit those who put their trust in him to be confounded for ever, is to be the child of benediction. "Blessed are ye," said the Saviour, "when men shall revile you and persecute you." The mere worldly life is felt to be such a paltry thing that those who really believe think themselves fortunate when they are permitted to throw it away in some worthy cause. In degenerate ages, above all, the nobler souls have a kind of thirst of martyrdom, as the only fit protest against the degradation of mere animalism. What can we ask of Nero and Domitian and their crowd but that they put us to death? The

most fatal mistake which the skeptic and self-indulgent world can make is to torture those who have faith and whose lives are innocent. Persecution, as Mr. Froude says, may succeed if it is thorough-going ; but it never can be thorough-going when the victim has a higher and mightier faith than his tormenter. To persecute to some purpose, a man must believe that he is thereby doing a service to God ; that he is working in harmony with the eternal and infinite purposes of the Creator.

To make martyrs of men because there is danger lest they be in the way of our getting a comfortable place at the great feed-trough of this cattle-pen of a world is to offend common sense. Universal suffrage, political constitutions, and government by majorities are, after all, only contrivances. They are machines which do their work well or ill, as the case may be, and which, as time goes on, need to be patched up and readjusted. Our grandfathers thought that the American Constitution was a part of the eternal fitness of things ; but we have hammered and tinkered away at it until we have discovered that it is merely the handiwork of man. A systematic persecution whose only justification is political expediency would be a mockery ; for political expediency is at best but a makeshift, and commonly means nothing more than that it is most desirable that certain sets of men should be in office and live on the fat of the land. In a society in which the craving for money and the interests of trade are supreme, public opinion will not approve of persecution ; for it unsettles values and shakes confidence. The commercial spirit is practical ; its philosophy is profit and loss ; and it holds principles and beliefs cheap. It would not barter its golden calf for all the theologies in the world ; and the enemies whom it most abhors are the fanatics who seek to stir up religious strife. Now, we are essentially a commercial people, and, so long as this remains the dominant feature of our social life, there is little danger of any serious persecution of the Catholic or any other Church. In fact, we have never been guilty of such atrocious bungling in any other business as in this matter of Catholic persecution. Our Native-American and Know-nothing parties fatally fall into the hands of mobs. Plug-uglies, thugs, and bullies of high and low degree come to the front, and for a brief day riot in arson and murder and the butchery of women and children, and then slink back into their lairs from the face of an outraged humanity. Public opinion recoils from these horrors, and Catholics are less hated than they were before ; while they themselves feel how fortunate it is

that the plug-uglies and thugs are unable to serve the Church in any other way than by murdering her children. But Mr. Froude mistakes the desires of his own heart for the sentiments of the American people. They neither love religious persecution nor believe in its efficacy. Had he kept his temper and listened with more docility to his anonymous American guide, he might have learned from him the views on this subject of our most extreme anti-Popery partisans. "We can not remedy the evil," says this writer, "by resorting to repressive measures. Repressive measures defeat themselves, and can not be recommended." For myself, I am confident my strong persuasion that serious persecution of Catholics in the United States is not probable does not spring from any dread of its consequences. In such a trial, whatever cause might suffer harm, the Church would be the gainer. Even those who look upon the Catholics of this age as degenerate must admit at least that they have not forgotten God's secret to the Church—the divine power there is in suffering for righteousness' sake. Whatever else they may have lost, they still know how to suffer; and the world takes care that this training-school at least shall be prepared for them at the public expense. It is well; it is the part of worldly wisdom to permit this power to lie dormant. The ancient proverb was, "Let Camarina alone, for it is best let alone."

But there is no need of taking so solemn a tone, when it is more natural to laugh at Mr. Froude. He has heard that the Yankees are a dyspeptic race, and, as his power of accounting for things is unlimited, he straightway seeks and finds the cause, which of course can be none other than "the growth of the Irish element." "They have absorbed," he says, "a substance which they have been unable to assimilate, and it interferes with their digestion." Now, I doubt whether there is in all this great country a medical practitioner who will say that this diagnosis is correct. It is not the growth of the Irish Catholic element that makes the Yankees dyspeptic—it is doughnuts and apple-pies. "The growth" of almost anything is precisely what your genuine American most delights in. He has the greatest country, the longest rivers, the highest mountains, the broadest prairies, the most thundering cataracts, and the largest cities of any man who walks the earth; and as Mr. Froude and his guide very properly remark, "there are times when the American eagle screeches itself hoarse in proclaiming the greatness of the nation."

"The figures in the census startle Americans," says Mr. Froude. Innocent man, who does not know that "the figures in the census" are our joy and our pride. There is hardly a town from Maine to Florida that does not make its population a third greater than it is. Jew and Gentile, African and heathen Chinese, are all received with delight because they swell "the figures in the census." Startle an American with figures! The thing is preposterous. There are seven millions of Catholics here, and the American feels that there ought to be fourteen millions, for the very simple reason that there ought to be more of everything here than anywhere else. We grow more wheat and corn, we raise more hogs and cattle, we build more railways, we dig more gold, we print more newspapers, we have more patriots and statesmen than any other people on the globe; and why shouldn't we have more Catholics? "Strange country!" said the bewildered Frenchman, "where there are a hundred religions and but a single sauce." Some apology might be made for him, but Mr. Froude ought to know that upon no account would Americans consent to part with even one of their religions, and, if they suspected that he had really serious intentions of destroying the Catholic Church in this country, they would give him no countenance whatever.

"The Americans," he says, "are light-hearted"; but he is probably the only intelligent man in the world who thinks so. They are serious even in their amusements, and their very laughter tells of hearts weighed down by the cares of life. They are not, indeed, as melancholy and solemn as John Bull, but they are eager and anxious, which the light-hearted are not. In a word, it is in every way abundantly manifest that this Englishman has no real knowledge either of Americans or of the Catholic Church in America. His intrusion, therefore, into our affairs is simply an impertinence.

The main head of Mr. Froude's attack upon American Catholics remains still to be considered. That the Catholic Church in this country is a powerful and well-organized body, while Protestantism, broken up into warring sects, bewilders its own adherents "with its confusions and ineffectualities," is a proposition which I am not going to deny. But I can not see what this state of affairs has to do with the Government or politics of the United States. I have been brought up to believe that this is a secular government—that there is here no union of Church and state; that the American citizen, as such, is neither Protestant nor Catholic, neither Jew nor Gentile; that it is not within the competency of Congress "to make laws

respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." If this church grows strong or that dies out, the American Government has no more right to seek to check the growth of the one or to revitalize the other than it has to prescribe what shall be the uniform of the French army. Interference in such matters would be in open violation of one of the cardinal articles of the organic law of the land. Why, then, should our politics be disturbed by the progress of the Catholic Church?

To say with Mr. Froude that it is because this religion "is by its own choice at war with every other" is not to the point. The Government can take no cognizance of the differences, disputes, and controversies of the various churches, so long as there is no breach of the peace. Now, American Catholics disagree with Protestants on various points of doctrine and discipline, as Protestants disagree among themselves on similar heads; but we dwell together in mutual good will and helpfulness, and it does not occur to any one to imagine that the politics of the country are in any way concerned with theological dogmas and articles of faith. Mr. Froude, however, is troubled by the English notions concerning a divided allegiance, and maintains that it is impossible to be loyal both to the Catholic Church and the American state. A good Catholic, he holds, can not be a true American citizen. "Every true Catholic," to quote his words, "is bound to act and think as his priest tells him, and a republic of true Catholics becomes a theocracy administered by the clergy. It is only as long as they are a small minority that they can be loyal subjects under such a Constitution as the American. As their numbers grow, they will assert their principles more and more. Give them the power, and the Constitution will be gone. A Catholic majority, under spiritual direction, will forbid liberty of worship, and will try to forbid liberty of conscience. . . . That it will try to do all this as long as it accepts the Ultramontane theory, which at present passes current, is as certain as mathematics."

These are grave charges, and they are boldly made. We will calmly and seriously examine them. "Every true Catholic is bound to act and think as his priest tells him." Is this a fair statement? Do good Catholics believe that they are bound to consult their priests as to how they shall carry on their business, or how they shall vote, or what legitimate pursuits they shall engage in? Do they believe that it is their duty to ask their priests what they are to think concerning the cause of yellow fever, or of the political corruption or dishonesty in business that is so prevalent; or what

is the best form of government ; or which party in the late civil war was in the right ; or whether Mr. Froude is insincere, or simply incapable of discerning truth from falsehood ? No. Upon these and a thousand other subjects Catholics think for themselves, and consequently do not think or act alike. They believe, indeed, that the Pope is infallible when, in his official capacity as head of the Church, he gives an *ex cathedra* definition in matters of faith and morals ; but this no more interferes with their practical liberty than the finality of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States makes slaves of American citizens. If the principle of religious authority is received at all, it necessarily implies the existence of some tribunal whose decrees shall be accepted as final, and therefore practically as infallible ; but this is equally true of all civil authority, and such a tribunal is protective, not destructive, of liberty. The political action of the Catholics of the United States is as little controlled by the Church as that of Protestants or infidels. The bishops and priests, with rare exceptions, have wholly abstained from intermeddling in political contests ; and were they to attempt to use the influence which their spiritual office gives them to such ends, the first to condemn them would be the Catholic people themselves. How it happens that the great body of our people vote with the Democratic party, I know not ; but I do know that the Church is in no way responsible for this preference. Catholics have as little to hope from the success of the Democratic party as they have to fear from that of the Republican. Protestant preachers have, as occasion offered, thrown their influence with this or that party or faction ; have gone so far even as to preach the gospel of bullets and denounce the Constitution as a compact with hell ; but Catholic bishops and priests have contented themselves with denouncing conspiracies against the rights of the Church as guaranteed by the Constitution. The only colony of the original thirteen founded by Catholics was also the first in which the principles of religious toleration were made part of the law of the land ; whereas the only attempt to found a theocracy in the New World was made by Protestants. In the Old World there is to-day greater religious liberty in Catholic France and Austria than in Protestant Prussia and Denmark. The attempt to predict what any body of men would do were absolute power given them is a kind of speculation into which the wise will never enter. There is in various centers of thought and influence in this country a suspicious leaning toward a centralized government and the rule of strong men, to use the

popular phrase ; but we do not therefore despair of liberty, and declare that our feverish political life will find rest and a grave in Cæsarism. Neither do careful men pretend to foresee that the fate of other republics will not also be the fate of ours. The destinies of nations and of civilizations are God's secret. No man can know with certainty what he would do in trying circumstances, when the path of duty itself seems to fade away from sight ; much less can he know what vast bodies of men would do in imaginary contingencies ; and, when Mr. Froude undertakes to predict with mathematical accuracy what a Catholic majority in the United States would try to do, he takes his place among weather-prophets and soothsayers. The superstitious may believe him. *Credat Judoæus apella.*

The appeal to the middle ages, which he makes, is not pertinent. To argue that Catholics in the nineteenth century hold the political views of those of the twelfth, is as unreasonable as it would be to suppose that the New-Englanders of to-day approve of burning witches. In barbarous ages the ignorant multitudes are little subject to moral influence, and hence society appeals to force, and this appeal is necessarily attended with abuse. We may not deny, as a principle, that the power of religion and the power of the state should work in harmony, but the relations of Church and state which best promote this end vary with the changing conditions of social life. The mediæval political connections of the Church were in no way ideal. They were the outcome of the accidents of the time ; and, as the past does not return, they will not return. That the Church survives the destruction of social forms which seemed to be a part of her life, and develops new strength in surroundings which had been held to be fatal to her very existence, is one of the evidences of her chronic vigor and indefectible power. Mr. Froude himself declares that men must be judged by their professions, and nothing more is needed to put this whole question at rest so far as the Catholics of the United States are concerned. From the day on which Charles Carroll signed the Declaration of Independence to this hour, our words and our acts and our blood have borne testimony to our devotion to the principles upon which this government rests ; and, were we nine tenths of the total population, we should no more think of interfering with the rights of those who differed with us in faith than do the Catholics of Belgium who are ninety-nine hundredths of the population of their country. Catholics accept the principles of American government as they take

their wives, for better or worse, and until death. These are our professions, and these are our honest and heart-felt sentiments. Mr. Froude, however, in spite of his maxim that men must be judged by their professions, refuses to admit that we can be loyal to our country ; and with his well-known courage he proceeds to prove to us that he is right. "The American Constitution," he says, "is the political expression of the principles which the Pope has violently condemned." This, of course, is false. No pope has ever condemned the American Constitution, even by implication. "But," insists Mr. Froude, "the Syllabus says that men are not free ; that they are not capable of taking care of themselves ; that the laity in the most important matters must be guided and governed by the clergy ; that the press ought to be under censorship ; that the Catholic religion being true, all others are false, and therefore ought not to be tolerated."

The Syllabus is a list of eighty propositions which Pius IX., at various times during his pontificate, declared to be errors ; but there is not one of them which asserts the principles which Mr. Froude would have us believe the Pope has condemned, and it is difficult to imagine that any one who has read that document could be capable of writing the sentence which I have just quoted.

Getting his arguments as his facts at second hand, he has confused the Syllabus with the Encyclical of December 8, 1864, in which Pius IX. condemned the following proposition : "All citizens *have the right to an entire, unlimited liberty* to manifest and declare publicly, by voice or the press, or in any other way, their thoughts—*whatever they may be*—and no authority, either *ecclesiastic or civil*, can in any way restrict this liberty." This the Pope declares to be an error, but so does common sense. There is no government on earth which could stand the strain of such a doctrine as this. Does our own grant entire and unlimited liberty to publish libel, or to print and circulate obscene writings, or to utter seditious and rebellious speech ? Political society necessarily supposes that each member of it renounces a portion of his natural liberty in exchange for benefits without which liberty itself is a doubtful good ; and the error which the Pope here condemns is that of the Socialists, who would overthrow all authority, human and divine. Mr. Froude himself, indeed, at the end of his concluding article, openly takes sides with the Pope in this matter. "A state of things," he says, "in which the action of government is restricted to the prevention of crime and statutable fraud, and where beyond

these limits all men are left to go their own way—to be honest or dishonest, pure or profligate, wise or ignorant, to lead what lives they please and preach what doctrines they please—may have been a necessary step in the evolution of humanity ; but, as surely, if no other principle had ever been heard of, or acted on, civilization would have stood still, hardly above the level of barbarism. As surely, unless the wheel of progress is to turn backward, and we are to decline as we have risen, the natural superiority of truth to falsehood, and right to wrong, will recover, in some shape or other, the form of practical authority ; and it is this principle of authority which Romanism has all along insisted on.” Mr. Froude, then, and the Pope are friends at last ; and, while the curtain falls upon the tableau, I shall beg leave to say but another word.

Authority and liberty are as essential to the order of the social world as the centripetal and centrifugal forces to the harmony of the universe. Excess of authority is tyranny, and excess of liberty is anarchy ; and tyranny begets anarchy, and anarchy ends in tyranny. In Christianity religion is organized into a separate power, and endowed with the highest moral authority which has ever influenced the destiny of mankind. Henceforth Church and state are for ever distinct : and the Church leans more to the side of authority, and the state more to the side of liberty ; and, in proportion as man attains to greater freedom, he ought more and more to recognize the divine authority of religion. The Catholic Church is the highest representative of this authority which the world has ever known ; and it is surely not rash to think that she has a great and beneficent mission to fulfill in an age and a country in which the individual has attained to the possession of the fullest liberty.

JOHN LANCASTER SPALDING, *Bishop of Peoria.*